APPENDIX E RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Comment	Page or					
No.	Sheet	Comment	Response			
	John A. Owsley (TDEC, DOE Oversight Division)					
1.		The statements notifying potential property owners of acceptable risk in the groundwater should also indicate levels of potential liabilities and responsibilities. It is suggested that when "use" of groundwater is mentioned, a clarification should be inserted so that no "use classification" can be made except as prescribed by Tennessee Water Control Act, T.C.A. 69-3-105(a)(2).	Parcel G was reviewed under the South Campus Facility RI/FS in 1995 pursuant to the FFA. However, Parcel G was not part of the property noted in the RI/FS as being contaminated. As a matter of policy, DOE will include in the deed for Parcel G appropriate restrictions prohibiting groundwater use as has been the policy for previous land transfers. The text in Sect. 4.4.1 will be clarified to indicate that no "use classification" for groundwater can be made except as prescribed by Tennessee Water Control Act, T.C.A. 69-3-105(a)(2).			
		Paul C. Boyer, Jr. (City of C				
2.		The EA describes the purpose of the proposed action is to preserve the museum as an asset to the City and to the surrounding region. The real property transfers are intended to help offset economic losses resulting from DOE downsizing, but also to help offset the City's long-term cost of operating the museum. My letter to ORO Manager Leah Dever dated March 27, 2001, and Ms. Dever's October 3, 2001 response, acknowledge the importance of AMSE as an attraction to the City and of Parcel G in meeting DOE's and the City's common objectives.	A sentence will be added to the EA in Sect. 1.1 (Purpose & Need) stating that the proposed action is also intended to help offset the City's long-term cost of operating the museum.			
3.		I recommend that the Parcel G. boundary be reconfigured to exclude all three Swine Waste Ponds, as these are liabilities and add no value to the development potential of the parcel.	Parcel G as currently configured includes the three former Swine Waste Ponds. For purposes of analysis, the ponds will remain in the EA. Reconfiguration of the Parcel G boundary to exclude the ponds could be a topic of discussion between the City and DOE during negotiations for the actual transfer.			
4.		Because deed restrictions and reversion clauses will have an impact on the marketability of the property, I recommend that these institutional controls be avoided for the subject parcels unless there is clear evidence of contamination that cannot be remediated. Easement and deeds should contain language that is consistent with the model established during the recent water plant transfer.	Land transfers are not accomplished on any "model" basis and are tailored to each specific action. The subject of deed restrictions and reversionary rights will be addressed during subsequent negotiations.			

Comment	Page or		D.
No.	Sheet	Comment	Response
5.		I recommend that the boundary of Parcel G be reconfigured	DOE acknowledges the City's comment about access to Parcel G.
		to incorporate the gravel access road, which begins at the gate	
		and runs along the northern border of Parcel G parallel with	
		the Bethel Valley right-of-way and fence. By doing so, marketability would be enhanced, and the development would	
		minimize further disturbance of environmentally sensitive	
		areas, particularly along Scarboro Creek.	
6.		I recommend that ownership of all artifacts be transferred to the	It is DOE's intention to maintain ownership of historic and scientific
0.		City as part of the museum conveyance; otherwise, DOE would	artifacts and archives currently on display or stored at the museum.
		still be actively engaged in museum operations, significantly	Prior to the transfer, DOE will conduct an inventory of the items
		reducing any benefit associated with the proposed action.	contained within the museum and make a determination on which
		reducing any benefit associated with the proposed action.	items have cultural/historical significance and require protection under
			the National Historic Preservation Act. It is assumed that those items
			that do not have a historical significance requiring protection would be
			transferred to the City.
7.		Since it does not appear that the TDOT project encompassed the	The scope of this EA was defined by the City's letter dated March 27,
		entire remaining 57 acres, and it is unclear why the parcel was	2001 to DOE requesting the transfer of Parcel G (18-20 acres). DOE's
		reduced to such a degree, I respectfully request that DOE review	response to the City's letter dated October 3, 2001 also stated that the size
		the situation and move to declare more the land surrounding the	of Parcel G being considered was 18.62 acres.
		subject acreage excess to the agency's needs. Such an action will	
		significantly enhance the marketability and cost-effectiveness of	
		developing the site, and will provide a greater assurance that	
		DOE's and the City's objectives as stated in the EA are met.	
8.	Sect. 3.2.2	Finally, several minor corrections and one clarification are	The last sentence in Sect. 3.2.2 will be deleted.
		recommended. Section 3.2.2 pertaining to air quality states that	
		Anderson County would not meet the new ozone standard and	
		Roane County would not meet the new standard for very fine	
		particles if the standards were implemented. Since these	
		standards have not been finalized by the Environmental	
		Protection Agency, statements suggesting noncompliance are	
		misleading and should not be included in the final EA.	
9.	Sect. 3.9.2;	Section 3.9.2 incorrectly states that the AMSE obtains refuse	The statement about refuse removal services will be corrected and the new
	pg. 5-3	removal services from the City of Oak Ridge. The City does	name for the former Boeing property will be added.
		not provide this service. Page 5-3 refers to the Boeing Site	
		Development. The new name for this development is Rarity	
		Ridge.	

Comment	Page or				
No.	Sheet	Comment	Response		
10.	Sect. 4.8.1.3	Section 4.8.1.3 describes the possible fiscal impacts of the	DOE will obtain and present the current AMSE budget in the final EA		
		proposed conveyance on the City. The final EA should include	to provide a comparison to the projected \$1.7 million budget.		
		additional information regarding the current budget for AMSE as			
		compared to the projected \$1.7 million budget the EA states			
		would be required to operate the museum in years 1-5, and \$1.8			
		million in years 6 and beyond.			
11.		The sentence in paragraph two of this section beginning "An	The text in the second paragraph will also be revised to read "An		
		increase of \$1.8 million" should read "An increase to \$1.8	increase to \$1.8 million"		
		million"			
12	Jo Ann Thompson				
12.		I ask that the 3.36 acres of wetlands including the Scarboro	The 3.36-acre figure in the Draft EA includes the wetlands within		
		Creek flood plain be protected by D.O.E. by placing permanent	Parcel G and the adjacent DOE property to the south. The wetlands		
		restrictions on Parcel G, prohibiting destruction of the wetlands and flood plain, prior to transfer of Parcel G to the City of Oak	within the Parcel G boundary only total about 1 acre. Prior to any development that might occur having the potential to impact the		
		Ridge.	wetlands and floodplain would be subject to regulation by the Corps of		
		Riuge.	Engineers and TDEC including obtaining any applicable permits.		
		D.E. White	Engineers and TDEE metading obtaining any applicable permits.		
13.		I would prefer to see the transfer of AMSE to a private	Comment noted. The proposed action includes UT-Battelle		
13.		endowment.	participating in a development campaign designed to establish an		
		chaowinent.	endowment for the museum.		
	L	Lloyd Stokes (ORHPA			
14.		AMSE EA is one the best that I have reviewed in several years.	It is not DOE's intention to place restrictions on the City regarding the		
		My only concern is that DOE "put restrictions" on museum	museum facility and the adjacent property. However, it is DOE's		
		building, land adjacent to museum and the cultural resources	intention to maintain ownership of historic and scientific artifacts and		
		owned by DOE to prevent their disposal/sale to anyone but a	archives currently on display or stored at the museum. Prior to the transfer,		
		"foundation" by the City of Oak Ridge. The nation and	DOE will conduct an inventory of the items contained within the museum		
		citizens of Oak Ridge need the AMSE to build our greatest	and make a determination on which items have cultural/historical		
		industry—tourism and the Manhattan Project. This should be	significance and require protection under the NHPA. DOE is currently		
		done to satisfy the NHPA, Executive Order 11593 and, of	working with the TN-SHPO to ensure the proper curation and		
		course, NEPA requirements. Why has AMSE not been	management of these resources. The proposed action includes UT-		
		submitted for the National Register of Historic Places?	Battelle participating in a development campaign designed to establish		
			an endowment for the museum. The AMSE has not been determined to		
			be eligible for the NRHP because it does not meet the NRCE and, thus,		
			is not yet considered to be an historic property.		

Comment	Page or				
No.	Sheet	Comment	Response		
Ed Westcott					
15.		My choice - Transfer to Private Endowment, UT-Battelle has	Comment noted. The proposed action includes UT-Battelle		
		resources to raise funds. Oak Ridge contractors have plenty of	participating in a development campaign designed to establish an		
		sources to raise money. Let them sell property to raise tax money	endowment for the museum.		
		for City. Keep the City out of this. City has no business trying to			
		run a museum. Museum cannot pay its way now. City is not in			
		real estate business. Let DOE sell property. City cannot be stuck			
		with Parcel G—too many restrictions. DOE take bids on			
		Parcel G or turn over to City to sell.			